



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,179	12/09/2005	Shigeru Akasofu	09857/0203535-US0	7982
7278	7590	05/19/2009	EXAMINER	
DARBY & DARBY P.C. P.O. BOX 770 Church Street Station New York, NY 10008-0770				CLAYTOR, DEIRDRE RENEE
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1617				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/19/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/560,179	AKASOFU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Renee Claytor	1617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 March 2009.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 13 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 13 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/27/2009</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Request for Continued Examination

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/11/2009 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicants argue over the 35 USC 112 first paragraph rejection that it is improper based on and unduly broad definition of "protection" in the specification. Applicants assert that the working examples enable the claimed subject matter in view of the definition "protection".

As discussed previously, it is noted that the term "protecting" as defined in the specification encompasses "prevention". There is no teaching in the specification that there is complete prevention of damage to neurons. The broadest reasonable interpretation is given to the term "protecting" and by Applicants own definition in the specification, the term protecting includes prevention. Therefore the claims are examined as they read on prevention and the 35 USC 112 rejection is maintained.

Based on Applicant's amendments to the claims, the 35 USC 102 rejection is withdrawn as there is now no teaching of protecting neurons from A β toxicity.

Due to Applicants amendments to the claims, the following new and modified rejections are given below.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for treating A β aggregation in cholinergic neurons in the CNS, does not reasonably provide enablement for protecting (interpreted by the Examiner to mean prevention) all neurons of the CNS. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The instant specification fails to provide information that would allow the skilled artisan to practice the instant invention without undue experimentation. Attention is directed to *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988) at 1404 where the court set forth the eight factors to consider when assessing if a disclosure would have required undue experimentation. Citing *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BdApls 1986) at 547 the court recited eight factors: (1) the nature of the invention; (2) the state of the prior art; (3) the relative skill of those in the art; (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the

Art Unit: 1617

art; (5) the breadth of the claims; (6) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (7) the presence or absence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary.

1) The nature of the invention and breadth of the claims: The nature of the invention and breadth of the claims are drawn to a method of protecting neurons of the central nervous system, comprising administration of donepezil.

2) The presence or absence of working examples and the amount of direction or guidance presented: In the instant case, no working examples are presented in the specification as filed showing how to prevent A β aggregation in cholinergic neurons. The specification outlines experiments showing that donepezil decreases A β aggregation in cholinergic neurons. Figures 8-10 shows that the addition of donepezil decreases A β aggregation in cholinergic neurons, proving that donepezil is effective at reducing A β aggregation and not for prevention of A β aggregation.

3) The state of the prior art: The “amount of guidance or direction” refers to that information in the application, as originally filed, that teaches exactly how to make or use the invention. The more that is known in the prior art about the nature of the invention, how to make, and how to use the invention, and the more predictable the art is, the less information needs to be explicitly stated in the specification. In contrast, if little is known in the prior art about the nature of the invention and the art is unpredictable, the specification would need more details as to how to make and use invention in order to be enabling. >See, e.g., Chiron Corp. v. Genentech Inc., 363 F.3d 1247, 1254, 70 USPQ2d 1321, 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2004).

The state of the art regarding treating A_β aggregation in PC12 shows that administration of donepezil decreases A_β toxicity (see Figure 1) but does not show total inhibition on toxicity induced by A_β (see NeuroReport (1998) 9, 1519-1522). Therefore, the use of donepezil is not art recognized as preventing A_β toxicity.

4) The quantity of experimentation necessary: Claims 13 and 18 read on a method of protecting neurons of the central nervous system, comprising administration of donepezil. As discussed above, the specification fails to provide sufficient support for completely preventing disorders, such as A_β toxicity in neurons. Applicant fails to provide information sufficient to practice the claimed invention, absent undue experimentation. Genetech, 108 F.3d at 1366 states that “a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for search, but compensation for its successful conclusion” and “patent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable”.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imai et al. (WO 97/46527).

Imai et al. teaches compositions comprising donepezil (meeting the limitation of the compound in claim 13) in differing polymorphic forms that are more stable against heat and humidity during storage (page 2, second full paragraph). Imai et al. teaches that the donezepil compositions are effective treatments for cerebrovascular diseases accompanying cerebral apoplexy, e.g. cerebral hemorrhage or cerebral infarcts which are associated with cerebral ischemia (see page 28, second paragraph).

Accordingly, it would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the compound donepezil to treat cerebrovascular diseases associated with cerebral apoplexy because it is known in the art that the polymorphic forms of the same compound treat the same conditions. It is well known in the art that polymorphic forms of a compound refers to different crystal structures of the compound itself; however, this does not change the compound such as it would not treat the same diseases. Accordingly, one would be motivated to use donezepil to treat cerebrovascular disease associated with cerebral apoplexy because it is known in the art that the polymorphic forms of donezepil treat the same disorders.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Renee Claytor whose telephone number is (571)272-8394. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Renee Claytor

/SREENI PADMANABHAN/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1617